

E-FILED 6/1/2009

NOT FOR CITATION
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

FACEBOOK, INC.,

No. C08-03468 JF (HRL)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR AN ORDER
SHORTENING TIME**

STUDIVZ LTD., VERLAGSGRUPPE GEORG
VON HOLTZBRINCK GmbH;
HOLTZBRINCK NETWORKS GmbH;
HOLTZBRINCK VENTURES GmbH; and
DOES 1-25,

[Re: Docket No. 165]

Defendants.

For the past seven months, the parties have vigorously wrangled over jurisdictional discovery. Indeed, plaintiff's first round of jurisdictional discovery requests generated no less than five time-consuming motions before this court – the first of which was withdrawn by plaintiff just prior to the motion hearing set for October 14, 2008. The second was withdrawn by defendants at the December 16, 2008 motion hearing. The third motion was heard on March 3, 2009 (along with the parties' respective motions for sanctions), and this court thereafter directed the parties to submit supplemental letter briefs as to the issues presented. Soon after, jurisdictional discovery was stayed while the presiding judge addressed the *forum non conveniens* issues raised by defendants in their pending motions to dismiss. The stay of discovery has now been lifted, and this court is informed that the hearing on defendants'

1 motions to dismiss have been re-scheduled for July 10, 2009.

2 Facebook now moves for an order shortening time as to another set of discovery motions
3 spawned by plaintiff's second round of jurisdictional discovery requests. Specifically,
4 Facebook moves for an order shortening time as to (1) defendants' motion to quash subpoenas
5 (Docket #159) and (2) plaintiff's motion to compel further discovery responses (Docket #163).

6 In view of the current briefing and hearing schedule on defendants' motions to dismiss,
7 this court will hear these second round of discovery motions on shortened time – albeit on a
8 somewhat different schedule than that proposed by plaintiff. It will also endeavor to rule on
9 them in due course. Given the numerosity and complexity of the pending discovery disputes,
10 however, the parties should not expect an immediate ruling from this court.

11 The briefing on defendants' motion shall remain the same – that is, plaintiff's opposition
12 shall be filed by **June 2, 2009**. Defendants' reply shall be filed by **June 9, 2009**.

13 Plaintiff's motion to compel shall be briefed as follows:

- 14 • Defendants' opposition shall be filed by **June 9, 2009**.
- 15 • Plaintiff's reply shall be filed by **June 11, 2009**.

16 Rather than hold two separate hearings on the parties' respective discovery motions,
17 defendants' motion to quash and plaintiff's motion to compel will both be heard on **June 19,**
18 **2009, 2:00 p.m.** in Courtroom 2.

19 SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: June 1, 2009

21 
22 _____
23 HOWARD R. LLOYD
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25
26
27
28

5:08-cv-3468 Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Annette L. Hurst ahurst@orrick.com

Gary Evan Weiss gweiss@orrick.com, sdonlon@orrick.com

I. Neel Chatterjee nchatterjee@orrick.com, adalton@orrick.com, kmudurian@orrick.com,
mawilliams@orrick.com

Julio Cesar Avalos javalos@orrick.com, aako-nai@orrick.com, adalton@orrick.com

Stephen Shannon Smith , Esq ssmith@greenbergglusker.com

Thomas J. Gray tgray@orrick.com, vcloyd@orrick.com

Warrington S. Parker , III wparker@orrick.com

William Mielke Walker wwalker@greenbergglusker.com

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.